

---

**PLUMAS COUNTY  
PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Minutes of the Meeting of June 16, 2016

---

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS:**

**Dr. Robert Abbott**, *Commissioner* (District 1)  
**Dr. Shauna Rossington**, *Vice Chair* (District 2)  
**Richard Rydell**, *Commissioner* (District 3)  
**Larry Williams**, *Chair* (District 4)  
**John Olofson**, *Commissioner* (District 5)

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Plumas County Planning Commission (the *Commission*) convenes in a meeting on June 16, 2016, at 10:03 a.m. in the Planning and Building Services Conference Room, Quincy, CA;

**II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

**III. ROLL CALL**

**Commissioners Present:** John Olofson, Larry Williams, Dr. Robert Abbott, Richard Rydell (attending telephonically) and Dr. Shauna Rossington

**Also in attendance** (*Supervisors and staff*)

Randy Wilson, Planning Director  
Rebecca Herrin, Senior Planner  
Supervisor Jeff Engel, District 5  
County Counsel Craig Settlemyre

**IV. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY**

No public comment is given.

**V. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

**a. High Sierra Rural Alliance appeal of Order and Judgment entered on March 24, 2016 filed on May 31, 2016**

Wilson reports that High Sierra Rural Alliance filed an appeal of the General Plan Update decision on June 1, 2016. Wilson explains the appeal process.

**b. Update on Plumas County Code to implement SRA FireSafe Regulations**

Wilson reports that staff met with representatives from the local fire protection districts and CALFIRE on June 1<sup>st</sup>. The revised code changes, based on comments from the fire protection providers, will be brought forward at a future meeting.

Wilson reports that he will not be in the county on July 7, 2016, the date of the next Commission meeting.

**VI. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: *Continued from April 21, 2016***  
**Public Hearing for Mohawk Valley Ranch, Inc.; Marcia White, applicant, and Planning Commission Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors**

Whitehawk Ranch General Plan Amendment (GPA 9-15/16-01)

150 Whitehawk Drive, Whitehawk Ranch, Clio, Unincorporated Plumas County, CA; Assessor's Parcel Number 133-130-115; T21&22N/R13E/Secs 5&32, MDM

Herrin summarizes the staff report, which includes a memo from Craig Settemire, County Counsel and reads emails and letters into the record, in order of their receipt:

- Robert W. Cook III and Victoria R. Cook
- Bruce Turkstra
- Pat Symons
- John and Arleen Condrin
- Whitehawk Ranch Homeowners Association
- Marcia L. White
- Troy Bostian

County Counsel Settemire provides a report based on the memo to the Commission. It is the County's position that the Development Agreement expired in 2009, making the existing commercial use in place in 2009 a legal non-conforming use. All new uses of the property must now be consistent with the General Plan and zoning for the property. Uses previously allowed by the Development Agreement, but no longer consistent with the General Plan designation and the zoning, would require a General Plan Amendment.

The project is considered a new proposal for evaluation under the General Plan and zoning criteria.

Herrin adds that an environmental document will be prepared and circulated and the project will be brought back to the Commission at a later date.

The hearing is open to the public. John Hodgson, of the Hodgson Company, representing Shelly Werner and thirteen other residents, speaks to the Commission. He questions whether an environmental document will be prepared. Wilson responds in the affirmative as staff has reported that a document will be prepared. Wilson adds that he cannot give an exact timeframe, but there is a required 30-day review through the State Clearinghouse.

Hodgson comments that the scenic corridor issue that was concluded as no longer applicable by Counsel may be raised again in the future. The Convenience Commercial (C-3) zoning is described as limited by staff but he feels it is not appropriate due to all the uses allowed by the zoning. Hodgson reads those uses permitted by right and permitted by use permit. He encourages the Commission to consider that carefully.

Chair Williams asks if there are any other members of the public that wish to address the Commission. There are none.

Williams opens the discussion up to the Commissioners. County Counsel Settemire advises that there needs to be an amendment to the proposal in the application to clarify what staff will

be considering. Discussion of the addition of the LTD (Limited Combining Zone) to allow county staff to review new future uses at the time of building permit application.

As this is a change from what was initially considered, there needs to be review of the type of environmental document that will need to be prepared.

Wilson questions Marcia White, applicant, if she intends to limit the uses to those previously permitted under the Development Agreement by deed restriction, to which she answers "correct".

Wilson explains that the amended application will be recirculated for feedback from local and state agencies, then staff will produce the environmental document. The public hearing will be renoticed. This process will take several months. Even the Planning Commission recommendation needs an environmental document. If the Planning Commission recommends a denial of the project, that recommendation would still be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for a final decision.

*M/S/C to direct staff to prepare an environmental document and return to the Commission for a public hearing: Abbott/Rossington/5-0.*

Commissioner Olofson notes that there is no agenda item for Planning Commissioner reports or comments. County Counsel Settlemire advises that specific items of discussion must have a place on the agenda or else are not permitted under the Brown Act. Brief reports or correspondence can be discussed under Commissioner reports, but this category should not be used for extensive discussion. If there are matters that have come up since the posting of the agenda, and a finding can be made that no one was aware of the omission and the matter can't wait, items can be added to the agenda by a 4/5 vote of the Commission.

Olofson responds that these are not pressing issues, just issues he would like to discuss at a future meeting. Commissioner Rydell agrees that the agenda should contain a specific item for Commissioner reports as on previous agendas. Chair Williams asks if these are issues that could be addressed with a one-on-one discussion with the Chair and/or Planning Director. Olofson answers that he would speak with Williams and Wilson.

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, motion is made by Dr. Abbott, seconded by Commissioner Rossington, with a unanimous affirmative vote recorded, to adjourn the meeting of June 16, 2016, at 10:43 a.m. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting is set for July 7, 2016, at 10:00 a.m., in the Permit Center conference room.

  
Larry Williams, Chair  
Plumas County Planning Commission

  
Rebecca Herrin, Senior Planner